



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

NESTOR'S SON PEISISTRATUS IN HOMER

Von Christ in his *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*⁴, p. 33, adds to the arguments for the difference between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* advanced by early Chorizontes this sentence: "Auffällig auch ist, dass die *Ilias* von dem oft in der *Odyssee* genannten Sohne des Nestor, Peisistratos, nichts weiss." Schmid has printed this sentence, with evident approval, in his revision of this work, so that it deserves the notice of those interested in Homer.

A simple answer to this argument is there was no occasion to mention Peisistratus in the earlier poem; the fact that a character was prominent in the *Odyssey* furnished no reason for naming him in the *Iliad*; even Penelope is not mentioned there, but as Odysseus is twice referred to as the father of Telemachus we can hardly doubt that the name of the mother was well known. There was rarely an opportunity for referring to the children of a Greek leader; Orestes is named but once, i. 142, repeated in 284, where Agamemnon promises that he will honor the reconciled Achilles as his own son, Orestes—a most natural reference. Diomedes, Idomeneus, and Ajax probably left families at home, yet no son is named. Nestor was far more inclined to refer to the days of his childhood than to those of his children.

However, these are general arguments, but in this particular case there is a most cogent reason for not naming Peisistratus in the *Iliad*, and that reason is he was born to Nestor after the departure of the Greeks for Troy. He was a young man of about the age of Telemachus, as the words of Peisistratus show:

γ 49: ἀλλὰ νεώτερός ἐστιν, δημηλική δ' ἐμοὶ αὐτῷ.

These words refer to Telemachus. We know that Telemachus was an infant when the Greeks departed. Cf. the words of Menelaus,

δ 112: Τηλέμαχος θ', ὃν ἔλειπε νέον γεγαῶτ' ἐνὶ οἴκῳ.

However young Telemachus may have been it is evident that Peisistratus was somewhat his junior; when they were mourning in the palace of Menelaus for the lost and absent friends and kindred Peisistratus said:

δ 199: καὶ γὰρ ἐμὸς τέθνηκεν ἀδελφεός, οὗ τι κάκιστος
'Αργείων· μέλλεις δὲ σὺ ἴδμεναι· οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ γε
ἤντησ' οὐδὲ ἴδον· περὶ δ' ἄλλων φασὶ γενέσθαι
'Αντίλοχον.

His youth and his failure to have seen his brother, Antilochus, furnish their own explanation, hence to mention him in the *Iliad* was not only unnecessary but impossible.

The wide limits of disintegrating criticism are shown by the fact that von Christ and Schmid found it "auffällig" that Peisistratus was not named in the *Iliad*, while Peppmüller, *Berl. Phil. Woch.* (1891) 231, condemned the same poem for naming Telemachus.

JOHN A. SCOTT

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

MARGINALIA ON APULEIUS'S *METAMORPHOSES*¹

P. 17. 9 (Helm) = i. 19: "sic denique eum vitalis color turbaverat. . . ." Helm wisely relegates to his apparatus his own emendation *mutatus* for *vitalis*, and all the other various changes (*tum* for *eum*, *calor* for *color*, *turpaverat* for *turbaverat*). As Oudendorp sanely observes: "immo sic mutando omnia dubia possimus quidem intellectu facilia reddere; sed et simul novos excudimus auctores." He rightly defends the MSS, quoting Plautus *Epid.* 560: "quid est quod voltus te turbat tuos,"² and Gellius XIX. i. 6: "coloris et voltus turbatione." Still, even if "vitalis color turbare ipsum dicitur cui turbatur pallore vultus" (Oudendorp), it is not easy to see why Apuleius did not express the idea as clearly as he does in 244. 7 (H.) = x. 10: "ingens exinde verberonem corripit trepidatio et in vicem humani coloris succedit *pallor infernus*" (quoted by Oudendorp). Perhaps wrongly we expect *letalis color*, which Markland proposed to read. I have wondered, though admitting the boldness of the suggestion, if *vitalis color* must not be added to three curious examples of *vitalis* that have not been mentioned in this connection: the funeral couch is called *vitalis lectus* in Petronius 42, grave-clothes are *vitalia* in Petronius 77, Seneca *Epist.* 99. 22, and in Lucretius iii. 820 the MSS give nothing but *vitalibus* in spite of the *letalibus* found in several modern editions since Lambinus. As a similar euphemism Friedländer quotes the use of *salutaria* in place of *funeraticia* (cf. his note on Petr. 42, and on euphemism in this connection Keller, *Gramm. Aufsätze* 154 ff., collects interesting evidence).

P. 34. 11 (H.) = ii. 11: "et perinde in eius faciem oculos meos ac si in Avernum lacum formidans deieceram." Readers of Herondas iii. 17 (the

¹ A slight correction of my note on Apul. *Metam.* ii. 29 in this volume, p. 90: the substance of the interpretation ascribed to Oudendorp appears in his note, but the form of statement is quoted from the Delphin edition. Had I known it at the time I should have added that Soping suggested *scatebris* for *salubris*.

² It is very singular that while the editors of Apuleius have long used the passage of Plautus to support the text of Apuleius, to the present day the passage of Plautus is rudely emended (Goetz, Leo) or marked corrupt (Lindsay), apparently in ignorance of the Apuleian phrase.